



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/811,231	03/16/2001	Philip R. Thrift	TI-20205.1	3125
23494	7590	10/06/2005	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			CHAWAN, VIJAY B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2654	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/811,231

Applicant(s)

THRIFT ET AL.

Examiner

Vijay B. Chawan

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-43, 47-48 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Upon further review of Applicants arguments filed 3/11/2005, and the specification, the examiner deems that claims 20-43 and 47-48 are allowable over the cited prior art of record. The Specification does not reasonably provide support for the subject matter of claims 44-46.
2. The finality of the rejection of the last Office action mailed 3/11/2005 is withdrawn.
3. The Double Patenting rejection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. There is no support for the claim language of claim 44 in the specification. The only reference to the claim language is the recitation of the claim language verbatim in the summary of the invention of the specification, and nowhere in the

Art Unit: 2654

specification, is there support to show how a speech user agent enabled to use phonetic models to allow recognition of a vocabulary word without training on that specific word is accomplished. Claims 45 and 46 depend upon claim 44 and are therefore rejected.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 20-43, and 47-48 are allowed.
7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Applicants arguments that the claims are allowable over cited combination of prior art is convincing. Applicants' arguments on pages regarding independent claims 20, 35, 36, and the claims that depend thereon on pages 8-15 of the response, that the combined art of Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., and further in view of Houser et al., and in view of Arons is convincing. Examiner agrees that the claims 20-43, and 47-48, are allowable over cited prior art.

Regarding claim 20, the combined art of Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., and further in view of Houser et al., do not teach the claimed apparatus comprising a speech user agent for **dynamically creating vocabulary, grammar and actions**, and a browsing module for the World Wide Web being responsive to said speech user agent, said speech user agent facilitating voice activation of said browsing module to access an information resource on the World Wide Web.

Regarding claim 35, the combined art of Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., and further in view of Houser et al., do not teach the claimed apparatus comprising a speech user agent for accessing a browsing module for the World Wide Web, said speech user agent for **dynamically creating vocabulary, grammar and actions** to enable said browsing module to access an information resource on the World Wide Web.

Regarding claim 36, the combined art of Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., and further in view of Houser et al., do not teach a method for embedding voice activated control information in HTML pages as delivered on the World Wide Web, wherein said voice control information is encoded in a grammar language and is interpreted by a Web client user-agent that translates user utterances into client actions.

Regarding claim 37, the combined art of Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., and further in view of Houser et al., do not teach an apparatus comprising a speech user agent that **dynamically creates vocabulary and grammar** and a browsing module for the World Wide Web being responsive to said speech user agent, said speech user agent facilitating voice activation of said browsing module to access an information resource on the World Wide Web.

Regarding claim 38, the combined art of Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., and further in view of Houser et al., do not teach an apparatus comprising a speech user agent for accessing a browsing module for the World Wide Web, said speech user agent **dynamically creates vocabulary and grammar to**

Art Unit: 2654

enable said browsing module to access an information resource on the World Wide Web.

Regarding claim 39, the combined art of Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., and further in view of Houser et al., do not teach and apparatus comprising a **speech user agent enabled to access a speakable Hotlist**, and a browsing module for the World Wide Web being responsive to said speech user agent, said speech user agent facilitating voice activation of said browsing module to access an information resource on the World Wide Web.

Regarding claim 47, the combined art of Stefanopoulos et al., in view of Schmandt et al., and further in view of Houser et al., do not teach a method of extracting link names from a page of a speakable Hotlist, comprising the steps of, speaking a link name, retrieving the link name from the page, identifying token(s) in the link name, creating pronunciation grammar(s) for the token(s), creating grammars for the link token(s), creating a grammar for all the links on the page, and adding the created grammars to the current set known by a speech recognizer.

Claims 2-43, 47-48 are allowable for the reasons stated above. Support for the claims are found on pages 3-11 of the disclosure.


Conclusion

Art Unit: 2654

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vijay B. Chawan whose telephone number is (571) 272-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Through Friday 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Vijay B. Chawan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2654

vbc
10/4/05

VIJAY CHAWAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER